

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/620,580	07/15/2003		William R. Bidermann	PIX-P-036P1	8865
32566	7590	01/29/2004	•	EXAMINER	
PATENT L. 2635 NORTH			MAI, LAM T		
SUITE 223			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE,	CA 9513	34		2819	
				DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		100
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/620,580	BIDERMANN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication one	LAM T MAI	2819
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Priod for Reply	ears on the cover sneet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. 8.133)
Stätus		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 J		
	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under <i>B</i> Disposition of Claims	nce except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the merits is 53 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.	·
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>1-5, 8-10, 12,14,17-20,23,25,27-29, 3</u>	1,3334 is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s) <u>6-7,11,13,15,16,21,22,24,26,30,32</u> is/a	are objected to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept	ted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exan	niner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		7.7
	is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a) The translation of the foreign language prov		
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 7/15/2003 comply with 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP 609. They have been considered and placed in the application file.

Drawings

Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/620,580

Art Unit: 2819

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12,14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-17 of U. S. Patent No. 6,518,909 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: an analog to digital converter for converting plurallity of analog input signals to a plurality of corresponding digital values.

More, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not petentably distinct from each ohter because the patent 6,518,909 teaches essentially the same circuit as claims 1-5, 8-10, 12,14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 31 of the instant application. Even though claims are boroadened by omitting certian limitations, it has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious experidient if the remaining element perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184(CCPA). Also note Exparte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be an obvious variation.

This is a obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12,14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31. and 33-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-17 of U.

Application/Control Number: 10/620,580

Art Unit: 2819

S. Patent No. 6,310571 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: an analog to digital converter for converting plurallity of analog input signals to a plurality of corresponding digital values.

More, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not petentably distinct from each ohter because the patent 6,518,909 teaches essentially the same circuit as claims 1-5, 8-10, 12,14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, and 33-34 of the instant application. Even though claims are boroadened by omitting certian limitations, it has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious experidient if the remaining element perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184(CCPA). Also note Exparte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be an obvious variation.

This is a obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they would be allowable considere for allowance if the obove double patenting rejections are overcome by filing terminal disclaimer.

Art Unit: 2819

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAM T MAI whose telephone number is (571)272-1807. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Tokar can be reached on (571) 272-1812. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Lam T. Mai Art Unit 2819 January 24, 2004 PATRICK WASSELEP PRIMARY EXAMINER